

REMARKS

Claims 9-11, and 13-24 are all the claims pending in the application, claims 1-8 and 12 having been cancelled by the present amendment, and claims 14-24 having been added by the present amendment. Claims 9, 11, 13, and 14 are the only independent claims.

Newly submitted claims 14-24 are presented to claim disclosed embodiments more completely, and have not been submitted in response to any rejection or objection. No new matter has been added. By way of non-limiting example, support for the newly added claims may be found in, for example, page 11, para. [0051], of the originally filed specification.

Applicant notes with appreciation that the certified copies of the priority documents have been received and that the originally filed drawings have been accepted.

Applicant acknowledges that claims 1-8 have been withdrawn from further consideration responsive to a Restriction Requirement. Applicant has cancelled these claims in anticipation of filing a divisional application.

The Examiner has objected to the title of the invention as not being descriptive. In response, Applicant submits the foregoing changes to the title.

Claims 9, 12, and 13 are objected to as improperly referring to PEP, instead of PET. The foregoing claim amendments provide the requested correction, and the withdrawal of this objection is believed proper and is earnestly requested.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) referred to in Figs. 3 and 4 of the present application. Claim 11 further stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. (U.S. publication No. 2004/0074655). Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA or Takahashi in view of Sugimachi et al. (U.S. patent 6,429,587).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, and requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the following arguments.

Claim 11

The Examiner rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) referred to in Figs. 3 and 4 of the present application, and as being anticipated by Takahashi.

Applicant notes that claim 11 has been amended to include the claim limitations of dependent claim 12. This claim has also been amended to include the claim limitations of claim 13, which the Examiner has indicated as being allowable. Applicant submits that claim 11 is patentable since claim 13 is allowable, and claim 11 includes the limitations of claim 13.

Claim 13

Page 5 of the Office Action indicated that claim 13 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and include all of the limitations of the base claim. As suggested by the Examiner, claim 13 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 11. Accordingly, this claim is also believed to be patentable.

Claims 14-24

Applicant recognizes that newly added claims 14-24 have not been formally rejected since they have been added by the present amendment. However, Applicant provides the following comments on the patentability of these claims.

Independent claim 14 recites “wherein both the mesh unit and the mesh frame are formed integrally together by a base film which has PET (polyethylene terephthalate) and metal foils.” This claim element is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Moreover, this feature is similar to the claim feature of allowable claim 13. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 14 is patentable, and dependent claims 15- 25 are also patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 14.

Lastly, claim 12 has been cancelled by the present amendment, rendering moot the rejection to this claim. Applicant acknowledges the other references made of record and not relied upon. However, there is nothing of sufficient relevance to require detailed discussion.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the present Amendment places all claims of the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: March 24, 2006

By:



Jeffrey J. Lotspeich
Registration No. 45,737
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 035884

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka
801 S. Figueroa Street, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: 213-623-2221
Facsimile: 213-623-2211